

Maryland Law Review

Volume 31 | Issue 2

Article 2

Editorial Section

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr>

Recommended Citation

Editorial Section, 31 Md. L. Rev. 99 (1971)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol31/iss2/2>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

Maryland Law Review

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

GREGORY L. REED

Articles Editors

KAYE TRUXTON BROOKS
DENNIS J. DuBOIS

Notes and Comments Editors

JUDITH A. ARMOLD
CHARLES R. MORAN
JAY I. MORSTEIN

Managing Editor

KENNETH C. LUNDEEN

Research Editor

JOHN CHARLES NASON

Associate Editors

DAVID A. LEVIN

JAMES E. CARBINE

STUART MARSHALL SALSBUURY

Faculty Advisor

HAL M. SMITH

Ass't Faculty Advisor

LAURENCE M. KATZ

EDITOR'S NOTE

This issue of the REVIEW contains a varied selection of contributions. Leading off is an article by Leonard E. Cohen and Monte Fried, entitled "*Multiple Jeopardy*" in *Employment Discrimination Cases*. In it the authors, members of the Maryland bar, discuss the complexities which have arisen as a result of the establishment of multiple legal remedies for one who is illegally discriminated against in his employment. Messrs. Cohen and Fried have provided a helpful guide to these procedural tangles, a guide which should alert the attorney to the kinds of problems involved in prosecuting — or defending against — an employee's claim of employment discrimination.

The question of "who is to regulate the regulators" is one which was posed by the creation of the first bureaucracy. Until recently, the only approaches to the problem were so bound up with the concepts of "standing," "ripeness," and "administrative discretion" that the effective answer to this question was: "No one." The public's growing concern about the state of our environment, coupled with its traditional disgust for the proliferation of "red tape," has led to the bringing of a number of suits by groups of concerned individuals

against government administrators; the plaintiffs, tired of having little or no effective voice in governmental decisions affecting every American's natural environment, sought to bypass the bureaucratic morass by the use of the injunction. *Environmental Defense Fund v. Hardin* was a decision which not only afforded standing to the plaintiffs on the basis of their concern for environmental matters, but also determined that a governmental administrator's continued inaction could be challenged in court.

The issue concludes with a comment on general powers of appointment in Maryland and a casenote on the question of whether, and in what circumstances, a resort to the judicial or administrative adjudicatory process constitutes a violation of the antitrust laws.

This is the final issue, in a long year, for the present editors of the REVIEW. Our successors for 1971-1972 are: Ann F. Hoffman, editor-in-chief; James E. Carbine, Gary F. Florence and William D. Levine, notes and comments editors; David R. Burke and Ezra Yehudah Siff, articles editors; Anthony H. Gamboa, managing editor; and Sondra Harans, research editor. The editors wish their successors the best of luck in the coming year. The editors also wish to thank the REVIEW's faculty advisor, Professor Smith, and its assistant faculty advisor, Professor Katz, for their valuable advice during the past year, and to express their appreciation to Mrs. Shirley Myers, the REVIEW's secretary, and to Mr. Chester Watkins and Mr. Floyd Duncan of the Daily Record Company, for their consistently good services.